DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 860 08 CE 018 897

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE Refining the Career Education Concept: Part III. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 50p.; For related documents see ED 132 427 and ED 146 362
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01903-5)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Changing Attitudes; Community Involvement; Educational Alternatives; Educational Change; Educational Responsibility; Experiential Learning; *Interagency Cooperation; Job Training; *Resource Centers; Student Needs; Vocational Education; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS *Experience Based Career Education; *Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

This third in a series of monographs on refining the career education concept contains six occasional papers: (1) "Psychosclerosis and Career Education" identifies the kinds of attitudinal change career education seeks to accomplish toward infusion, collaboration, education, and American youth; (2) "Youth, Work, and Schooling" specifies the major contributions the education system can make to employability and discusses possible strategies for educational change; (3) "Applying the Concept of Collaboration to Education/Work Policy" discusses three key words (commitment, responsibility, and authority) and the implications they have for collaboration in education/work policy actions; (4) "Thoughts on EBCE and Career Education" presents a brief picture of the nature and current status of career education and four alternatives for consideration by those currently working in Experience-Based Career Education; (5) "YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education" specifies obligations of the formal education system found in the Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, provides a list of youth needs to be met by the collaborative effort involving the education system, and identifies a series of opportunities for basic education change; and (6) "The Community Career Education Resource Center Concept" discusses the rationale behind the concept, the Center's nature and functions, and alternative approaches to establishing and operating this Center. (BM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED164860

# MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

# REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT: PART III

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, *Commissioner*

CE 018 897

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1971

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402
Stock No. 017-080-01903-5

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | *Page* |
|---|---|
| Preface | iii |
| Psychosclerosis and Career Education | 1 |
| Youth, Work, and Schooling | 7 |
| Applying the Concept of Collaboration to Education/Work Policy | 13 |
| Thoughts on EBCE and Career Education | 21 |
| YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education | 29 |
| The Community Career Education Resource Center Concept | 39 |

## REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT: PART III

### Preface

Each year, since 1976, I have tried to gather together the key "occasional papers" prepared during the year and place them in a single OCE monograph. By so doing, we hope to make some continuing contributions to the evolution and refinement of the career education concept. The papers in this monograph–minus a special set prepared this year in the domain of postsecondary education–constitute the 1977-78 refinement effort.

Two of these papers–"Youth, Work, and Schooling" and "Applying the Concept of Collaboration to Education/Work Policy" have been prepared for publication in other places. Each has been slightly edited by its publishers from the form in which it appears here. I wanted them here in their original form. Both concentrate strongly on the concept of collaboration which has been one of the prime focuses within OCE during the past 12 months. They hopefully will stimulate readers to seek out and study the entire monograph series on "Collaboration In Career Education" which have been prepared during 1978.

The "Psychosclerosis and Career Education" paper is one most properly read in conjunction with the "Youth, Work, and Schooling" paper. Taken together, both have implications for those concerned with implementing career education. While they approach the problem from different perspectives, the basic topic is the same in both papers. Both have been used repeatedly during 1978 as official OCE speeches delivered to State career education conferences.

The "Thoughts on EBCE and Career Education" paper was delivered only once–and that was the Second Annual EBCE National Network Conference held in Washington, D.C. on February 28, 1978. For some time, the EBCE effort within both OE and NIE has evolved and operated in a fashion independent of the conceptual efforts within OCE itself. A sizeable number of Federal dollars has been expended in demonstrating various EBCE models. It seemed to me that, in order to reduce confusion among LEA and SEA personnel, it was essential that some attempts be made to identify and suggest resolution of some of the most obvious conceptual conflicts between EBCE and "career education" as envisioned within OCE. This paper was cleared at the highest levels within USOE prior to delivery and *does* represent a USOE–*not* just an OCE–position.

The "YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education" paper was prepared to represent OE's position at the initial regional workshops held by DOL for LEAs and CETA Prime Sponsors. It is obviously an embryonic beginning effort. The topic is of much greater importance than it appears to be from this presentation. Currently, OCE is moving actively to collect and distribute much more comprehensive and useful information about YEDPA's implications for the professional education community. This paper is only the beginning of what must become a major effort.

Finally, the "Community Career Education Resource Center Concept" is a paper that, prior to this time, has never been presented anywhere. It simply represents an idea I had one time that I thought should be written down. OCE is following up this idea during 1978-79 with an RFP that will hopefully illustrate its viability.

– Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

## PSYCHOSCLEROSIS AND CAREER EDUCATION

I once saw a sign in a dentist's office that contained the following definition: PSYCHOSCLEROSIS–HARDENING OF THE ATTITUDES. It is a definition most appropriate to consider when one contemplates the probable future of career education.

That is, in my opinion, career education has reached a stage in its evolution where reasonably clear answers are present for those who ask what it is, why it is needed, how to do it, and whether or not it will work. While, to be sure, such answers will continue to gain in clarity and refinement, they are already available in sufficiently positive terms so as to justify moving toward a sustaining career education effort. The basic problem, then, is not the efficacy of career education, but rather attitudinal changes required for implementing the basic changes in American education that the career education effort seeks to accomplish.

Literally hundreds of attitudes exist that require changing. Rather than attempting to identify them in specific fashion, I have chosen here to discuss them in four broad classes. These include: (a) attitudes toward infusion; (b) attitudes toward collaboration; (c) attitudes toward education; and (d) attitudes toward American youth. For each of these four classes of attitudes, I would like to identify the kinds of attitudinal change career education seeks to accomplish.

As examples of attitudes are identified within each class, I would hope you would consider each in two ways; first, in terms of the extent to which this is an attitude you hold; and, second, in terms of the extent to which this is an attitude you see existing in others. If you do so, you will be able to judge career education's future for yourself.

### Attitudes Toward Infusion

One of the bedrock principles of career education is that career education seeks to infuse employability skills within all existing educational programs and courses rather than add another course or set of courses to the existing curriculum. Several attitudinal problems are currently acting to impede implementation of infusion efforts.

One is the "what do you *really* have in mind?" attitude. This attitude is held by those who still seem to believe we are really trying to build a career education "empire" to be run by a new kind of specialist in education. When such persons see current actions aimed at employing career education facilitators at the school district level and at establishing community education/work councils, they seem to interpret this as meaning their fears were justified. It would be ironic, as well as tragic, if the mechanism we establish to make sure infusion works were to cause some to believe we never really wanted infusion in the first place.

A second attitude to be changed is seen in the statement, "I'm willing to help you with your problem." Teachers expressing such attitudes have obviously not accepted the goal of education as preparation for work as one of *their* responsibilities. The infusion approach cannot work until accountability comes to the classroom for attaining career education learner outcomes. Those teachers who resist accountability on the grounds that "you're adding to my load" worry me particularly. Such teachers must realize that the goal of education as preparation for work is one the general public has expected them to be accountable for all along. It is not a matter of "adding to the teacher's load," rather, it is simply a matter of accepting a responsibility that has always been present.

The classroom teacher *is* the key person in career education implementation efforts. That is why the single greatest emphasis in the new career education legislation is placed on providing inservice education to the teaching faculty. It is also why, in that legislation, career education specialists are called for at the school *district*, but not at the school *building* level. Real change can come to education only in the classroom. We must overcome these attitudes before this can happen.

**Attitudes Toward Collaboration**

In addition to infusion, the concept of collaboration stands as the second bedrock principle of career education. The concept of collaboration in career education is viewed as a process involving shared commitment, responsibility, and authority between the formal system of education and various segments of the broader community for meeting identified career education learner outcomes. Current negative attitudes, both within education and among members of the business/labor/industry community, are preventing the concept of collaboration from being fully and effectively implemented.

On the business/labor/industry side, the attitudes often heard can be summarized in the following way:

> Preparing youth for work is the responsibility of the formal education system. We have a real interest in the success of education in meeting this responsibility and are willing to help. If educators desire our help, they must tell us exactly what they want us to do, for how long, and at what cost. We will then be able to respond in a specific fashion.

We would like to see such attitudes changed in ways that would make the following statement represent the general attitude of the business/labor/industry community:

> Preparing youth for work today is a community responsibility. It is not something the education system can do adequately by itself. We are willing to join forces with educators in meeting and accepting this responsibility. We are willing to make a sustaining commitment to this effort provided education does likewise.

On the education side, the negative attitudes toward implementing a true collaborative effort can be summarized in the following way:

> We in education need and appreciate assistance of the broader community in preparing youth for work. All career education policy decisions, however, must remain with the Board of Education. Career education is an educational program, not a community program.

We would like to see such attitudes changed in ways that would make the following statement represent the general attitude of the formal education system:

> We in education recognize that we have neither the talents nor the resources to adequately prepare youth for work through only our own efforts. While the school board must retain responsibility for broad education policies, there are a host of programmatic policies required for implementing career education that must be evolved through the joint efforts of educators and members of the business/labor/industry community.

In short it is a matter of encouraging the education system to "let go" at the same time we are encouraging the business/labor/industry community to "take hold." Obviously, these two events must go together if chaos, resentment, and disillusionment are not to occur. Until this happens, we do not have "collaboration," but only "cooperation"—and the career education effort cannot succeed that way.

**Attitudes Toward Education**

The advocates—and opponents—of career education come from diverse segments of education and the broader community. Some who support, and some who oppose, career education do so for very good reasons based on positive attitudes. On the other hand, some of career education's supporters, as well as many of its opponents, bring negative attitudes to bear in doing so. The negative attitudes I am referring to here include those of lack of confidence, trust, respect, or hope for American education in terms of its potential for helping solve problems of education/work relationships faced by today's youth. Some persons seem to delight in pointing out the relatively small influence our education system plays in altering youth employment/unemployment problems. Others appear to concentrate their attention more on pointing out weaknesses in our education system and errors made by some engaged in its operations. Still others devote a great deal of effort to pointing out various forms of alternative education and proclaiming such alternatives to be superior to the current education system. Some in each of these "camps" can and do make very convincing arguments, complete with data, and supporting their views. I would be the last to say such arguments are completely lacking in validity.

Instead, I would point simply to the fact that career education is an approach to educational change built on a basic sense of confidence, pride, and trust in the American education system. Career education seeks infusion of its contents into the curriculum, but it does not advocate abandoning that curriculum. We seek to improve the ability of today's teachers to deliver effective career education, but we do not propose replacing them. We seek to broaden educational opportunities for all students by utilizing the resources of the broader community, but we do not seek to substitute such opportunities for those available in the education system itself. We seek to reallocate existing educational dollars, but we do not seek massive new sources of funding to add something structurally different from that which now exists.

In doing so, career education is being built on such positive attitudes as: (1) the education system can—and should—make some positive contributions to problems youth face in education/work relationships no matter how many other negative factors may be operating; (2) the American education system, in spite of its obvious weaknesses, is the best yet devised for bringing quality educational opportunities to all of the children of all of the people; (3) today's teachers are the best prepared we have ever had. Further, most are conscientious professional persons, who, given sufficient time and information, are both willing and able to infuse career education into the teaching/learning process. The truly mediocre teacher is a rarity, not a commonplace occurrence; (4) it will be far better for youth, and for the nation, to devote our energies to improving our current system of education than to replacing it or establishing a

dual system to compete with it; and (5) it will be better to prepare youth for employment than for unemployment.

It is, I think, particularly important for those in the broader community who join with educators in the collaborative career education effort to examine their own attitudes about the American education system. If they do, I would hope they conclude that, like American democracy itself, it is, with all its shortcomings, far better than any substitute system that could be invented.

**Attitudes Toward Youth**

Finally, I would like to comment briefly on attitudes existing toward those career education seeks to serve—the youth of this nation. Of all the attitudinal problems to be overcome, this, to me, is the most serious and the most important.

For want of a better term, the negative attitudes I want to refer to here can be called "youthism"—an expression designed to be analogous to racism or sexism as a basic source of bias and prejudice in American society. In my opinion, "youthism" is fully as serious a social disease in America as racism and sexism. It results in a stereotype that says American youth are irresponsible persons who neither know nor value work and so cannot be trusted to hold responsible positions in the American occupational society. The concept of "youth jobs" that Coleman referred to several years ago has, so far as I can determine, never been refuted nor seriously challenged. Coleman contends that American youth, ages 16-24, who seek employment in America have available to them primarily only "youth jobs"—jobs with little challenge, little pay, little skill requirements, and little hope for advancement up a career ladder. Being "not quite grown up" is considered synonymous with being "irresponsible."

If I, as a career education advocate, held such a negative view of youth, I would leave education for employment in a different area. Career education has been built around a basic sense of belief and confidence in American youth. Most youth I know would much rather look forward to being employed than to being on welfare. Most youth I know are capable of accepting responsibility if given the opportunity and the skills required for doing so. Most youth I know want to learn if we can show them how they can use what they are asked to learn. Most youth I know want to make positive contributions to making and keeping America strong, safe, and healthy. Most youth I know will welcome and profit from a career education emphasis in American education.

We have emphasized repeatedly, in career education, that youth lack knowledge, understanding, or appreciation for the American system of private enterprise. This emphasis has resulted in repeated calls for creation of opportunities for youth to interact with those engaged in private enterprise so they will understand our system better and appreciate it more. I would contend that those in the private enterprise system have as much to learn about today's youth as youth have to learn from them. If those in the private enterprise system will approach youth with the same kinds of positive attitudes we are trying to instill in youth toward that system, I think they will be pleasantly surprised. To me, this is one of the biggest hopes for career education—i.e., if it works, perhaps we can make some positive progress toward reducing "youthism" in our nation.

In my opinion, the future of career education depends on eliminating negative attitudes and promoting positive attitudes. These include attitudes toward the infusion strategy, toward attaining true collaboration, toward the American system of education, and, most important, attitudes toward youth themselves. If positive attitudes can become commonplace in these four areas, I have high hopes for the future of career education. I am confident that we are moving in that direction.

## YOUTH, WORK, AND SCHOOLING

As society becomes increasingly complete, relationships between education and work become less perfectly correlated. They do not, however, cease to exist. Rather, they change both in their strength and in their basic nature. Such changes hold serious implications for educators and for others concerned with problems of youth employment, unemployment, and underemployment. My purpose here is to share some thoughts regarding these implications.

Assuming the presence of positive, but imperfect, relationships between education and work, the formal education system cannot be considered as either totally responsible nor totally blameless. The two basic problems to be faced are: (a) determining the contributions the education system can reasonably be expected to make toward the youth unemployment problem; and (b) identifying strategies for educational change that can be viewed as appropriate and effective in these times.

Before considering these problems, it must be made clear that changes in youth employment rates cannot be considered, by itself, as an appropriate criterion for use in evaluating the effectiveness of education's contribution to the total solution. It is inappropriate to hold the education system accountable for such large contributing factors as: (a) the number of jobs available; (b) the rate of economic growth; (c) the impact of inflation; or (d) changes in productivity. It would, it seems to me, be extremely difficult to assess, with exactness, education's contributions to such factors. On the other hand, the education system can, and should, be held accountable for significant contributions to readiness of youth for employment—i.e., for youth employability. It is *employability* then, not *employment*, that, to me, should be considered as the prime criterion for use in evaluating education's efforts with respect to problems youth face in becoming members of the occupational society.

Let me now proceed to an attempt to specify the major contributions the education system can make to employability. This will be followed by a discussion of possible strategies for educational change aimed at the fact, that these contributions can be made.

**Contributions of Formal Education to Employability**

The goal of education as preparation for work has always been one of the prime goals of American education. Increasingly, during the last 50 years, that goal has been interpreted primarily to mean equipping school leavers with specific entry-level vocational skills for use in gaining membership in the occupational society. This has been seen as a prime purpose for vocational education at the secondary school level, occupational education at the community college level, occupationally oriented majors at the baccalaureate degree level, and, of course, of the vast majority of graduate education. The need for such specific entry-level vocational skills continues to increase in importance.

Meeting such needs, however, cannot be considered synonymous with attaining the goal of education as preparation for work. If school leavers are to meet the criterion of employability, the education system must do much more than simply providing them with specific entry-level vocational skills. The K-12 school system that changes only by increasing the quantity and quality of vocational education is not meeting its employability responsibilities. Neither is the college or university who responds to the need only by increasing its attention to occupationally oriented majors while ignoring or downplaying the crucial contributions of liberal arts education. The presence of other employability skills and the serious responsibilities of the entire formal education system—from the elementary school level through the college and university system—must be recognized and accepted.

The additional employability skills I am referring to here can be quickly listed. They include:

1. Basic academic skills of mathematics and/or oral and written communication.

2. Good work habits leading to productivity in the workplace.

3. A personally meaningful set of work values that will lead the individual both to value work and to want to work.

4. Basic understandings of the American economic system and the general nature and importance of work in our society.

5. Self-understanding of vocational interests, aptitudes, and abilities along with an understanding of related educational/occupational opportunities.

6. Career decisionmaking skills.
7. Job seeking, job getting, and job holding skills.
8. Skills in utilizing and discovering unpaid work as productive use of leisure time.
9. Skills aimed at effecting positive change in the occupational society including those required for reducing stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of choice.
10. Skills useful in humanizing the workplace for oneself and for moving up in the occupational society once entry has been gained.

An initial reaction of many who view listings such as this is to ask, "isn't this what the education system has always done?" Those who respond in this fashion must surely recognize that, to whatever extent this has been an effort of the education system, it surely has not been an effective one. The time has come to change the education system in ways that both emphasize the importance of imparting such skills and demonstrating their effective delivery to students.

**Implementing Change in Education: Choosing a Strategy**

A constant call for change is essential to the dynamic growth and development of any part of society. Such calls are rooted in the need to find purposefulness and meaningfulness in basic goals. Any part of society that resists or ignores the need to change tends to stagnate and die out in the ecosystem of the larger society.

There are only two basic avenues available for accomplishing change. The first, is to change–either by increasing or decreasing–the currently available resources. The second, is to change ways in which currently available resources are utilized.

The traditional approach to change taken by American education has been that of seeking increases in resources. The appropriateness of such an approach rests on assumptions that: (a) there is nothing wrong with the way the education system currently operates; (b) the addition of new resources to current operations will enable new challenges to be met; and (c) funds can and will be made available to pay for such additional resources and programs. None of these three assumptions appears valid today in light of the most recent Gallup Poll on Education.[1]

[1] Gallup, George
*Phi Delta Kappan*, 1977

The alternative avenue to change available to American education assumes that: (a) there *are* serious deficiencies in effective utilization of current educational resources; (b) such additional resources as are needed can be found through utilizing better and more effectively community resources outside the field of formal education; and (c) American educators are susceptible to changes in attitudes and actions. There appears to me to be some reason to believe that each of these three assumptions possesses a degree of validity.

For this reason, I would choose the second approach to change over the first. Such a decision rests on a strategy that holds: (a) it is a "people change" approach dedicated to changing the attitudes and actions of educators, students, and members of the broader community; (b) a "program add-on" approach to change involving new courses and new kinds of teachers is to be avoided; and (c) an infusion approach to melding new and existing content can be devised that will not detract from an emphasis on existing content.

Three bedrock principles lie at the heart of this strategy. The first principle is that, for learning to be effective, that skill or knowledge to be learned must be recognized as important and valuable by both those who learn and by those who assist in the learning process. Other things being equal, more learning will occur when students who want to learn are in classrooms with teachers who want to teach. If this principle can be effectively implemented, such current popular topics as declining test scores, discipline in the classroom, and high truancy rates will surely be alleviated. The key thing to concentrate on is inserting a sense of purposefulness and meaningfulness into the teaching/learning process.

The second bedrock principle is that, for an effective emphasis to be placed on implementing the goal of education as preparation for work, the physical and personnel resources of the broader community must join forces with educators. Educators do not have the time, the talents, the knowledge, or the resources to accomplish this task by themselves. Needed resources exist in every community that can and should be utilized. The best way to prepare students for the world of work is not to lock them up in a schoolhouse thus keeping them away from that world. The days of educational isolationism are past.

The third bedrock principle is that, a conscious and conscientious emphasis on the goal of education as preparation for work can serve as an effective *vehicle* for implementing the first two bedrock principles. Both the knowledge and the skills to be imparted, important as they are, will, in the long run, be relatively less important than the use of the goal itself as a *vehicle* for basic change. If successful, use of this vehicle will also enhance attainment of other basic goals of education. This is most important. The specific goal is to bring a

greater and more appropriate emphasis to the goal of education as preparation for work. The generic goal, however, is to improve the quality of education.

**Implementing Change in Education: Applying the Strategy**

Let us assume that there is agreement that American education should change in ways that more effectively deliver employability skills to students. Let us further assume that the strategy chosen is that of making better use of existing resources. The question remains, how is this strategy applied?

A first answer to this question is that the strategy must begin in the elementary school years and continue through all levels of education. Providing youth with employability skills can, in no rationale way, be defended as a task to be delayed until the time they are ready to leave school for work—or even until the time they enter secondary education. The need for employability skills is as great for college/university students and for adults facing mid-career changes as it is for K-12 students.

A second answer is that application of the strategy must take place under conditions that neither demean nor detract from other worthy goals of the education system. To pretend that all of education's efforts should be devoted to attaining the goal of education as preparation for work would be a fatal mistake.

A third answer is that, of all persons involved, the key persons are the teaching faculty. Application of the strategy must be carried out in ways that enhance attainment of both process and content goals of the teaching faculty. Earlier attempts to join community resources with those of the education system have failed because they either: (a) ignored the teaching faculty; or (b) asked the teaching faculty to perform tasks over and beyond those related to their teaching assignments. Real change can come to education only if it is highlighted in the teaching/learning process.

Fourth, the broader community must share responsibility with the education system for the successes—and the failures—of this effort. It is thus inevitable that the broader community also share in formulation of basic policies. The former use of community *cooperation* must be replaced by a true *collaborative* effort.

Fifth, because of the multiple variety of actors involved in application of the strategy, unique reward systems must be built for each kind of "actor." If such rewards cannot be monetary, then they must at least be psychic. The "What's in it for me?" question is one that must be answered in a variety of ways. It is much more difficult than would be the case were the strategy to be

implemented through program "add ons" with one or more persons assuming total responsibility.

Sixth, the presence of a variety of kinds of "actors" makes special problems for those seeking to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy. Specific roles and responsibilities must be assigned to each kind of "actor." The evaluation design must take assessment of performance of such roles into account.

Finally, the newness of this approach to educational change must be recognized. Because of its newness, it will be difficult for those accustomed to the categorical program "add-on" approach to change to understand its basic nature and mode of operation. Similarly, its newness makes it inevitable that many mistakes will be made leading those who participate and/or observe such mistakes to abandon their efforts. It seems probable to me that the broader community–not the formal school system itself–must, in many instances, serve as the catalyst to sustain the effort.

The American education system has clear, but far from exclusive, responsibilities for the current youth unemployment problem. The best and most viable way in which the education system can contribute to solution of these problems is through equipping school leavers with employability skills over and beyond specific entry-level vocational skills. If this is to come about, it will mean major change in the education system. The basic strategy most appropriate for making such change is that of reallocation of current education resources–not a new "add on" categorical program effort. For this approach to educational change to work, the broader community must join forces with the education system. Some attempts to implement educational change through this strategy have already been carried out under the banner of "career education." It is a difficult, but not an impossible, task.

## APPLYING THE CONCEPT OF COLLABORATION TO EDUCATION/WORK POLICY

The term "collaboration," in *Webster's New World Dictionary*, is defined in two ways as follows: (1) "the act of working together, as in writing a book" and (2) "cooperation with the enemy." It is important to emphasize, at the outset, that it is the former, rather than the latter, definition that is to be used here!

When applied to the generic topic of education/work policy, the term "collaboration" can be defined more specifically to mean: *"A process involving shared commitment, responsibility, and authority between the formal system of education and various segments of the broader community for meeting identified learner needs in the education/work relationships domain."* While no pretense is made that this definition will find universal acceptance, it is important to emphasize that it represents the meaning of the term "collaboration" as used here.

Several basic assumptions combine to form the basis of need for this concept of collaboration. These include:

1. The term "education" includes much more than "schooling." Many learning opportunities for persons exist in the broader community over and beyond those found in the formal system of "schooling."

2. It would be inefficient to try and impossible to succeed in an attempt to incorporate all community learning resources within the formal system of education; i.e., "schooling."

3. The educational needs of today's students cannot be adequately met by the education system alone. The learning resources of the broader community are needed and must be utilized.

4. The prime concern must center around the extent to which learner needs are met, not on which segment of the community receives "credit" for meeting them.

5. Learners will profit most if various kinds of community learning resources are coordinated with those of the education system in ways that enhance and expand the variety and quality of learning opportunities for each person.

6. Various kinds of community learning resources can best help persons if they join forces, rather than compete, with the education system. Our common concern for those we serve should be sufficient motivation for doing so.

The three key words in the definition of collaboration presented above are "commitment," "responsibility," and "authority." The purpose of this paper is to discuss implications of these three words for the concept of collaboration in education/work policy actions.

**The Concept of Shared Commitment**

Collaboration between the education system and the broader community must start by mutual recognition of their joint interest in and concern regarding specific identified learner needs of those served by the education system. A listing of such needs that might be used to determine the extent to which such shared commitment exists in a given community includes, in the case of an education/work policy, the need of learners to acquire:

1. a better understanding of the interdependence of occupations;
2. a more diversified set of opportunities for career exploration;
3. improved attitudes toward work as an essential element in society;
4. a better understanding and appreciation of relationships between work and total lifestyle patterns;
5. improved ability to communicate effectively with adult workers;
6. an increased motivation to learn subject matter taught in schools;
7. a more complete and realistic understanding of how a business organization operates;
8. an increased understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system;
9. a better understanding of ways in which personal skills and abilities of different persons relate to the community's need for workers;
10. a better understanding of the concept of competition in the labor market and stimulation to compete for jobs in the labor market;

11. a better understanding of the variety of career paths followed by adult workers during their working lives;

12. an opportunity to use adult workers as role models for career decision-making.

It has been said that if one's goal is to put a man on the moon, the first requirement for doing so is to recognize this is what one is trying to do. Similarly, if the concept of collaboration is to be applied to education/work policy concerns, the first requirement is for both educators and members of the broader community to agree that a set of learner needs exist which, up until this time, have not been met. They must further agree that these needs are important and that both sides—i.e., the education system and the broader community—have specific things to gain were these needs to be met.

It is important to emphasize the last point. To recognize the existence of a set of common learner needs, such as listed above, may in and of itself be sufficient to bring educators and persons from the broader community together for purposes of expressing their interest and concern. It will not, however, be sufficient to enter into a *sustaining* collaborative effort aimed at meeting such needs. The motivation to begin and the motivation to continue a given effort are quite different things. Agreement on the existence of a set of important learner needs may be sufficient motivation to begin. To continue demands that both educators and members of the broader community have, in addition, a clear set of answers to the "What's in it for me?" question—i.e., ways in which both the education system and the broader community will benefit if such learner needs are met. Answers to the "What's in it for me?" question can be expected to vary widely both within the family of professional educators and among various segments of the broader community. It is not vital that such answers be shared with all others at the beginning, but it is vital that each of the "actors" have faced the necessity of beginning to answer this question for himself/herself. Otherwise, the result is likely to be the accumulation of a great number of good intentions which gather "dust" while waiting for any significant action steps to be taken.

**The Concept of Shared Responsibility**

For too long, the education system and the business/labor/industry community have each tended to blame the other for not meeting the kinds of learner needs identified above. When they tire of doing so, they often join forces and blame the learners themselves who, are least of all, at fault. Collaboration cannot and will not work under such circumstances. On the contrary, a collaborative effort demands that those involved begin with a

mutual atmosphere of trust, respect, and confidence in all parties involved. Members of the broader community must recognize that the American system of public education, with all of its shortcomings, is the best system yet devised for meeting the educational needs of all of the children of all of the people. Similarly, educators must recognize that the American system of private enterprise, with all of its shortcomings, is still far superior to alternative economic systems existing in other parts of the world. Collaboration can occur only when both parties—i.e., the education system and the business/labor/industry community—recognize the positive potential each possesses for helping to meet learner needs in the education/work relationship domain.

If this is done, it will be easy to recognize and acknowledge that all elements involved can make positive contributions to meeting the set of identified learner needs. Look at the list of identified learner needs listed earlier. Can you find any that the education system could not, to some extent, meet all by itself? Similarly, can you identify any that the business/labor/industry community could not, to some extent, also meet all by itself? Assuming the answer given to both questions is "No," the next logical question is "Why, then, have not such learner needs been better met?" Hopefully, the answer given to that question will be divided into two parts: (a) neither party involved has done all that party *could* do to meet these learner needs; and (b) such learner needs will be better met if both parties join forces and accept mutual *shared responsibility* for meeting them.

The basic problem to be solved is that both parties have assumed that preparing youth for work is solely the responsibility of the education system. Further, both have assumed that, in the long run, the education system must be held accountable for the success or failure of this effort. The broader community has often expressed a willingness to help the education system solve the problem, but they have not accepted any "ownership" of the problem itself. Similarly, the education system has welcomed assistance from the broader community, but has routinely resented attempts on the part of the broader community to participate in programmatic policy decisions affecting actions taken to solve the problem.

Collaboration cannot take place until and unless both parties accept the principle that preparing students for work is a task that the education system cannot adequately accomplish by itself. Both the resources *and the expertise* of the broader community must be utilized along with those of the education system. The broader community must accept some of the responsibility and the education system must allow this to happen. Accountability for the successes—and the failures—of the total effort must be shared by all concerned. Unless this happens, all that exists is *cooperation*, and true *collaboration* will not have taken place.

**The Concept of Shared Authority**

Societal "truisms" are created based sometimes on fact and sometimes on myths. They continue only if there is at least a solid element of truth in them. One such "truism" is phrased in this way: "Anything that is everyone's business soon becomes the business of nobody." The concept of collaboration is obviously susceptible to the consequences of this truism. If collaborative efforts are to be implemented on a sustaining basis, some organizational structure that is in charge must be created. It seems clear, even at this early stage of things, that it would be unwise to attempt to find and promote a single model under an assumption that it could be appropriately applied in every community. Community differences are too great. What will work best in one community will not work best in another. Three possible models, each of which is in operation somewhere, will be briefly described here.

Model I is best represented by the IPAR effort in Portland, Oregon. IPAR is an organization established, controlled, and essentially operated by the business/labor/industry community in the Greater Portland area. Representatives from the education system are members of the IPAR Council, and the Portland Board of Education contributes a small amount of funds annually to the IPAR efforts. However, the vast majority of IPAR Council members and the vast majority of its operating revenues come from the business/labor/industry community. It is physically housed and operates outside the education system. It is much more than a simple service agency to the education system. In addition to playing this role effectively, IPAR also serves as an organization devoted to encouraging and promoting experimentation and the widest possible community involvement with the education system. It is basically controlled by the business/labor/industry community and counts on annual contributions from that community for its financial stability.

Model II is illustrated by the many community career education action councils operating under, and created by, local boards of education. This arrangement is typically operated under the administrative direction of a person carrying the title of "community career education coordinator." That person is employed by the local board of education and the model typically is housed in some educational facility. The advantages seen for this model include:

1. It assumes the presence of hard education dollars on a continuing basis. This hard line education budget item assures the broader community that they can count on the permanency of education's commitment to a collaborative career education effort.

2. The council, since it is created by and reports to the Board of Education, stands a far greater chance of influencing school board policy than if it were to operate as a community agency independent of the board of education.

3. The person in charge will, as a school board employee, be entitled to participate in the fringe benefits (retirement, hospitalization, etc.) of the education system. Without such benefits, it will be difficult to attract a competent person to the assignment on a career basis. Moreover, as part of the education system, the presence of physical facilities on a continuing basis are assured.

4. As part of the education system, the council has multiple opportunities to influence needed change within the education system that would be difficult to duplicate from the "outside."

5. Because the council is established by board of education action in no way prevents it from receiving part—or even a majority—of its operating funds from the business/labor/industry community.

Model III is illustrated by the several community education/work councils currently operating, under the general direction of the National Manpower Institute, with funds made available under a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. The basis assumption behind the creation and operation of such councils is that they operate as a "broker" between the education system and the broader community but owe their primary allegiance to neither. The primary advantages of this model can be summarized as follows:

1. It establishes a non-threatening forum not "owned" by any single segment of the society.

2. It allows and encourages a wide variety of community elements to support the council financially so that all feel they are participating, not just cooperating, members.

3. It allows the council to remain problem/solution oriented and not tied to any particular effort or "crusade" operating either within the education system or in the broader community.

4. It avoids any danger of being forced to stand with any one of the collaborative partners against another. It does not defend the school board against the community nor the community against the school board.

5. It maximizes the number and variety of community based organizations serving out-of-school youth in the community and, in no way, limits its primary operations to serving only in-school youth.

The hard questions that any community interested in a collaborative education/work effort must address include: (a) How is the effort to be sustained on a continuing sound financial basis? (b) How will the effort operate in ways that maximize *internal* collaboration on both sides as well as *external* collaboration between the education system and the broader community? (c) How can the collaborative authority be exercised with all segments involved in ways that do not interfere or undermine the broader mission of any single participating element? and (d) Who is to be appointed as the individual charged with day-to-day operational responsibilities? Individual communities, it seems, will have to answer such questions for themselves. No single national model now in existence appears to be a universal basis for answering these hard questions.

**Implementing Collaborative Efforts: Paying the Price of Perspective**

It takes very little time or deep thought to recognize that a community collaborative education/work effort holds great potential for meeting a wide variety of related needs. Certainly, it is needed for effective implementation of career education. It is an equally appropriate mechanism to use with vocational education advisory council operations. Similarly, it is a mechanism much needed for effective implementation of the current YEDPA's effort of the U.S. Department of Labor that calls for actions of both community-based organizations and education systems in concert with CETA prime sponsors. Those concerned with problems of adult mid-career change are bound to look on the concept of community collaborative education/work efforts with much favor. So, too, are those community elements looking for better coordination of existing out-of-school efforts aimed primarily at helping youth solve problems of education/work relationships. Theoretically, a community collaborative education/work council, and its resulting operations, will serve all these societal elements.

From a practical point of view, however, to begin such an effort with this broad array of goals does not seem wise. In each of the areas identified above, there are a host of internal, as well as external, collaboration problems to be solved. The first requirement of any community education/work council must be that it gains sufficient strength, support, and demonstrated evidence of effectiveness so that it can continue on a sustaining basis. For this to happen, it seems to me that this effort must begin by concentrating on only a portion of the many areas in which it could logically become involved. It would seem

better to take on only as much as it seems possible to deliver effectively at the beginning. If initial success results in, say, a three- to five-year period, then the parameters of its operations can be expanded. If the initial efforts fail, so, too, will the organizational structure established. Small successes are to be preferred over large failures. At least, that is the way it seems to me.

The concept of collaboration is long overdue in American society. The emergence of recognized need for implementing education/work policy at the community level holds high promise as a vehicle for use in converting the concept of collaboration into operational actions. The road to implementation of collaborative efforts is filled with many "rocks" including some labeled as "turfsmanship," "defensiveness," and "resistance to change." The needs of both youth and adults for solving problems they face in solving education/work relationship problems will, hopefully, serve as sufficient motivation for some of us to traverse this rocky road, no matter how difficult the task. The needs of those we seek to serve will justify our efforts.

## THOUGHTS ON EBCE AND CAREER EDUCATION

Each of the four major models for Experienced Based Career Education has produced positive evidence of effectiveness. Such results are apparent when one looks at evidence of student enthusiasm, acceptance by the business/labor industry community, hard data relative to progress of participants toward career maturity, or increases in basic academic achievement of participants. On all of these counts, the four EBCE models have demonstrated themselves to be effective mechanisms. I salute both this record of accomplishment and the willingness of those responsible for the EBCE effort to amass it.

If evidence of actual effectiveness were the sole criterion used for determining educational change, American Education would undoubtedly have a quite different history. That is, some innovations with unquestioned effectiveness have been discarded while others, whose evidence of effectiveness is either lacking or of questionable validity, have gained strength and acceptance. This has occurred because educational decisionmakers must use evidence of effectiveness as only one of a number of criteria to be considered when making judgments. In addition to this criterion, educational decision-makers must also utilize such criteria as (a) cost effectiveness; (b) ease of implementation; (c) internal resistance to change existing among educators; and (d) external resistance to change existing within the broader community. The worth, or lack of worth, of a particular form of educational innovation is necessarily only one of a series of criteria used.

A second preliminary point regarding educational innovation would also seem to be in order. In general, it seems safe to say that, within the "family" of professional educators, a small percentage exist who are particularly attracted to the notion of educational change and innovation. Such persons, in addition to their interests in innovation, possess two other special characteristics: (a) they know how to write proposals that will get funded with Federal grant money; and (b) they know how to produce positive results in their projects. They have *not* typically known how to use their results to motivate the great majority of educators–i.e., those of whom educational innovation and change do not have positive appeal–to buy their results and so to change in the indicated direction. When change fails to occur, those who could be called the "true educational innovators" typically move on to a new form of innovation and begin again. This, too, is part of the history of American Education.

It is within the framework of these two historical perspectives that I would like to speak here. In order to say with the greatest possible clarity what I would like to convey, I have divided these remarks into two parts. First, I would like to present a brief picture of career education–its nature and current status. Second, I would like to present four alternatives for consideration by those currently working in Experienced Based Career Education. I do hope that this form of presentation will be helpful to you in decisions you are attempting to make at this conference.

## Career Education: Its Nature and Present Status

### Nature

Career education can be pictured as an attempt to change American Education in ways that bring a more appropriate emphasis to the goal of "education as preparation for work" among the several basic goals of education. The generic nature of the kind of educational change being championed by career education can be outlined quite independently of its content. Among its bedrock parameters, the following are especially crucial to this discussion:

1. Career education is conceptualized and organized around the theory and research of career development. Thus, it is pictured as an effort that begins in the pre-school years and continues throughout most of the life span. It thus fits into the concept of lifelong learning.

2. Career education is pictured as an effort that is needed by and applicable to all of the children of all of the people. It is, in no way, intended to serve only a special segment of the student population.

3. Career education is an attempt to bring a proper focus to the goal of "education as preparation for work" in ways that neither demean nor detract from any other worthy basic goal of American Education.

4. Career education's prime delivery mechanism within the formal school system is infusion. It seeks to establish no new courses, curriculums, or alternative school structure. It seeks to create internal change within existing educational personnel, but it does not seek to add new kinds of educational personnel at the building level. It is a "people change," rather than a "program add-on" approach to educational innovation. It places basic trust in currently employed educators and curriculums. It depends on existing programs but does not seek to add yet another.

5. A second facet of career education's delivery system is the concept of collaboration between the school system and the broader community–including both the business/labor/industry/professional/government community and the home/family structure. A bedrock tenet of career education holds that career education is not something schools can do by themselves–that it must become, both in terms of actions and in terms of accountability, a community effort, not just a school effort. Thus, in addition to direct joint school/community interaction career education also supports other community efforts to help youth in career exploration and decisionmaking as part of the career education concept.

6. Finally, career education is an approach to educational change that seeks to increase educational productivity without substantially increasing the educational budget. It asks school systems to reallocate the way they spend currently available dollars instead of asking the community to support increased per-pupil costs for education. The primary costs of career education are pictured as those involved in providing: (a) inservice education to currently employed educators; and (b) career education coordinators at the school district/community level–but *not* at the building level.

**Current Status**

Since formally coming into existence in 1971, the career education concept has been introduced into more than 9,000 of the 16,000 + K-12 school districts in this nation. In the last few years, it has also become increasingly popular in a wide variety of postsecondary education settings ranging all the way from community colleges, to four-year colleges and universities, and even into adult education efforts. During this same period of time, it has been endorsed by such groups of major educational decisionmakers as: (a) the Council of Chief State School Officers; (b) the National School Boards Association; (c) the American Association of School Administrators; (d) the National Association of Secondary School Principals; and (e) the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Among practitioners within the education system, career education has been endorsed by such diverse groups as: (a) the American Personnel and Guidance Association; (b) the American Vocational Association; (c) the National Education Association; (d) the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; (e) the National Council of Social Studies; (f) the American Industrial Arts Association; and (g) the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language, as well as others. It has also been endorsed by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Within the broader community, career education has been endorsed by such groups as: (a) the Chamber of Commerce of the USA; (b) United Autoworkers of America; (c) United Rubber, Plastics, Linoleum, and Cork Workers of America; (d) National Federation of Independent Businessmen; (e) American Legion; (f) Boy Scouts of the USA; and (g) Women's American ORT.

The number and variety of endorsements career education has received exceeds its record of hard evidence demonstrating its effectiveness. While many preliminary indications of effectiveness exist, there is no way that career education, as a total movement, could be said to have complied anywhere near as effective a record of effectiveness as has Experienced Based Career Education. There is no doubt about that.

To some, the "bottom line" with regard to the current status of career education is seen in the recent signing into law of P.L. 95-207–THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT OF 1977–by President Carter. The Congress and the President, by this legislative action, have demonstrated their support and endorsement of the career education concept. To others more skeptical, passage of P.L. 95-207 is the "next to the bottom line" with the real "bottom line" to be decided by actions of the 95th Congress with respect to appropriations for this new law. As you know, such decisions have yet to be made.

Thus, while career education's record of demonstrated effectiveness is still modest, its record with respect to acceptance of basic nature and goals is quite impressive. It would, I think, be difficult to justify an assertion that there has been little interest in, enthusiasm for, or acceptance of the career education concept. Its marketing strategies, at least to date, have been successful.

During this same period, Experienced Based Career Education has operated, first, as an alternative delivery mechanism of career education and, during the last few years, as an effort independent of the mainstream of career education. It is with this kind of background that I would now like to turn to what seems to me to represent current major available strategies for Experienced Based Career Education to consider in relation to the career education concept as a whole.

**Strategies For Consideration by EBCE**

Since establishment of OE's Office of Career Education in 1974, Experienced Based Career Education has operated completely apart from OCE. It still does. Rather than continue to ignore this fact, it seems to me the time has come to consider some alternative strategies for EBCE to consider vis-a-vis its

possible relationships to career education. Four basic strategies appear to me to be available, each of which deserves brief discussion.

**Strategy A: Compete With Career Education**

One obvious strategy available to EBCE is to embark on an ambitious campaign to compete with career education as an approach to educational change. Certainly, the impressive record of EBCE effectiveness provides a powerful base for use by those wishing to adopt this strategy. Such a campaign would logically begin by emphasizing the relative advantages of EBCE over traditional career education in terms of research and evaluation evidence. The record already exists.

To adopt such a strategy would, of course, demand that EBCE simultaneously seek to emphasize the differences between itself and traditional career education in a clear and forceful manner. While the four existing EBCE models differ somewhat, it would not seem difficult to claim that the EBCE approach—with the possible slight exception of the RBS model—is one carrying the following basic assumptions:

1. EBCE is best thought of as an alternative curriculum, if not an alternative school, approach to educational change.

2. EBCE is an approach that is to be considered appropriate for the secondary school, but not the elementary school setting.

3. EBCE is an approach that is designed to appeal to some, but not all, of the student body.

4. EBCE is an approach that seeks to place major responsibility for acquisition of academic skills on the broader community with classroom teachers best viewed as learning facilitators.

5. EBCE is an approach that calls for the presence of new kinds of educational specialists at the building level.

In each of these ways, EBCE could be clearly pictured as resting on a different conceptual base than traditional career education. EBCE proponents can, of course, be expected to delete some of the differences I have outlined here and may well choose to emphasize others. That is not the point. Rather, the essential action required is to clearly state and emphasize the differences between EBCE and traditional career education. If competition is to be the "name of the game," this kind of effort will be essential. The goal, of course,

would be to encourage educational decisionmakers and members of the broader community to endorse EBCE over traditional career education. It is certainly a strategy that is readily available and well worth serious consideration.

**Strategy B: Add EBCE To The Total Career Education Effort**

A second currently available strategy is to embark on a campaign aimed at convincing educational decisionmakers that a *program* of EBCE should be added to existing school programs so that the *concept* of career education can be effectively implemented.

The rationale appropriate for use here is simple and straightforward. It builds on recognizing the fact that career education's implementation is already heavily dependent on a number of kinds of educational programs that receive no direct career education dollars. Such programs include vocational education, cooperative education, and work experience education in addition to the variety of academic education programs. In combination, such existing educational programs supposedly meet the educational needs of all students. Career education efforts are being infused into all of these programs, but the programs themselves are not supported by career education funds.

EBCE advocates might easily make the claim that, for some students, yet another kind of educational program–namely, EBCE–is needed. The evidence of fairly large numbers of youth who are "turned off" by existing educational programs is solid and impressive. It could effectively be argued that school boards and taxpayers should invest in one more program to meet the needs of such students. If this idea could be sold, it would be obviously easy to demonstrate how this new kind of educational program makes sizeable and substantial contributions to implementations of the career education concept. There is no doubt, that this is already being demonstrated in those school systems who have moved to add an EBCE program to their currently existing career education efforts. Several such school systems are represented in this audience.

The primary difficulty with this approach is that it does involve asking for substantial increases in the education budget. Whether or not this idea can be readily marketed in these times is open to question. Still, logically, this is certainly a viable alternative for EBCE advocates to consider.

**Strategy C: Become A Champion Of Experienced Based Education**

A third immediately available strategy for EBCE to consider would demand only that the word "career" be dropped from its title; i.e., instead of being known as "experienced based *career* education," attempt to be known as "experienced based education."

Operationally, as I read the EBCE literature, this is the general direction in which EBCE appears to be headed. That is, when critics raise, as an objection to EBCE, the claim that EBCE emphasizes only the goal of "education as preparation for work," EBCE advocates quickly point out that this simply is not true. On the contrary, they say, the EBCE approach encompasses all of the basic goals of American Education including such goals as academic achievement, wise use of leisure time, citizenship, and cultural appreciation in addition to the goal of education as preparation for work. Such assertions are, of course, necessary in order to justify the EBCE process that calls for participating students to spend a majority of their time in learning experiences outside of traditional classes taught by traditional teachers.

Viewed in this way, EBCE becomes a true educational *revolution* as opposed to the more *evolutionary* nature of traditional career education. The research basis justifying a radically different approach to learning for certain segments of the student body is easily justified both by the general domain of experiential learning and by the obvious fact that some students do not profit greatly from the traditional teaching/learning process.

If this strategy for institutionalizing the EBCE concept were to be adopted, EBCE advocates would surely have to advocate making alternative curriculums, if not actual alternative schools, available for choice by students. If this notion could be sold initially to educational decisionmakers, its long run success would, of course, be determined by the number and kinds of students who choose this learning approach over others available to them. As I read the EBCE literature and think about high school students, I feel it would appeal to many. It may well be the best of all possible strategies to adopt.

The major difficulties such a strategy would encounter, it seems to me, would lie in: (a) its revolutionary nature; and (b) the perceived—even if not real—threat it poses to many of today's classroom teachers. Such difficulties are not insurmountable, but they are real and must be faced.

**Strategy D: Become An Educational Methodology**

Traditional career education, as you know, is properly viewed more as a methodology for educational change than as a new kind of program, course, or

curriculum. It is possible that EBCE might choose to adopt a strategy leading toward joining with traditional career education as an educational methodology.

To do this, of course, would demand that EBCE consider and emphasize ways of infusing its approaches into the regular classroom in ways that allow the total teaching/learning process to extend beyond the walls of the classroom. This, obviously, is what traditional career education has done. To adopt this strategy would demand that EBCE advocates seek to share the knowledge, expertise, and materials they have amassed over the last several years with persons now engaged in traditional career education. A wide variety of ideas, materials, and approaches to interacting with the broader community have been developed by EBCE advocates which, if made a part of traditional career education, hold high promise for increasing its effectiveness. Not all of the current cognitive content of EBCE could be made a part of traditional career education in view of the fact some of this content stands in opposition to basic career education concepts. This does not mean that such content need be lost; i.e., it can certainly become a very valuable part of the more generic area known as experiential learning.

The obvious large disadvantage inherent in adopting this strategy is that it would lead to disappearance of EBCE as a separate entity in its own right. Instead, EBCE would be remembered primarily as an effort that helped to build the content and increase the effectiveness of the career education movement. There is little point trying to pretend otherwise.

The four strategies I have presented here need not, obviously, be considered as the only ones available to EBCE advocates at the present time. Various combinations and permutations of these four strategies are possible and other completely different strategies may well be developed. I would suspect that, among current EBCE "crusaders," some may well be found who would embrace each of the basic strategies outlined here. That is as it should be.

For my part, I do not pretend—nor contend—that one of these strategies is wiser or more desirable than any of the others. In my view, they are, at present, equally viable and defensible strategies to consider. Obviously, I, as a career education advocate, would hope that the fourth may appeal to most EBCE advocates more than the other three—but that is a hope, not an assumption. In the long run, the strategy—or strategies—adopted by EBCE advocates to institutionalize the knowledge accumulated by the EBCE effort over the last several years must be chosen by each of you who, today, regard yourselves as active participants in the EBCE "crusade." No one, I hope, would want it to be otherwise.

## YEDPA: OBLIGATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION

Since 1960, the ratio of youth to adult unemployment has remained stable at about 3:1. Likewise, the ratio of unemployment among non-white youth, as opposed to white youth, has remained at about 2:1. During this same period, underemployment among youth, defined as the number accepting employment at a lower level than that for which they are prepared, has increased dramatically.

Conscious and conscientious attempts to deal with this problem have been mounted in recent years by various parts of the Department of Labor, by a variety of community based organizations, and by the formal education system. From a "results" viewpoint, these efforts have not succeeded in altering these ratios. This, of course, does not mean that good and worthwhile things have not been learned nor that youth, in general, have not received assistance.

The Congress, in enacting the Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, recognized the past contributions of these three societal elements by including all of them in the legislation. In doing so, the Congress asked each to: (a) increase the intensity and variety of their actions; and (b) work together rather than separately. When results are assessed, the "bottom line" will be the extent to which the youth/work/schooling problem has been alleviated. The "next-to-the-bottom line" will be the extent to which and the effectiveness with which a true collaborative effort has been initiated.

The purpose of this presentation is to address responsibilities of the formal education system in this collaborative effort. Its basic thesis is that, as education discharges its obligations under YEDPA, a series of opportunities for needed basic structural changes in education will inevitably emerge. While the YEDPA, by itself, is not a sufficient *reason* to change the American education system, it may well become a *catalyst* for change.

To defend this thesis, an attempt will first be made to specify obligations of the formal education system found in the YEDPA legislation. This will be followed by a listing of youth needs to be met by the collaborative effort involving the education system. Finally, a series of opportunities for basic educational change growing out of methods required to meet education's obligations will be identified and briefly discussed.

**Obligations of Education Found in the YEDPA Legislation**

The YEDPA law–P.L. 95-93–identifies specific obligations of education in several places. They can be summarized as follows:

**Title I – Young Adult Conservation Corps**

1. The Secretary of Labor is required to work with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make suitable arrangements whereby academic credit may be awarded by educational institutions and agencies for competencies derived from work experience. (Sec. 804(e)). *This requirement exists in spite of the fact that the formal education system will not be directly involved in providing nor in evaluating training.*

2. The Secretary of the Department of Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture may make grants to any public agency or organization for State and/or local programs funded with the 30 percent of funds set aside for State and local programs. (Sec. 806(a)(2)). *Public educational institutions qualify for such grants.*

**Title II, Subpart I – Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects**

1. The prime sponsor must provide assurances that arrangements have been made with the appropriate LEA that participating in-school youth are enrolled and meeting the minimum academic and attendance requirements of the school. (Sec. 327(a)(4)(K)). *LEAs have obvious obligations to supply prime sponsors with these data under clear agreements.*

2. The Secretary of Labor must, in his report to the Congress, include data with respect to the degree to which employment opportunities provided have caused out-of-school youths to return to school or others to remain in school. (Sec. 329(3)). *LEAs have clear obligations to: (a) devise and implement arrangements for out-of-school youth to return to school; and (b) participate in efforts to encourage in-school youth enrolled here to remain in school.*

3. The prime sponsor must provide assurances that consultation has been held with public and private nonprofit educational agencies including vocational and postsecondary education institutions. (Sec. 327(a)(4)(D)). *Educational institutions have an obligation to provide such consultation.*

4. Employment opportunities provided youth participating under this subpart may take place in LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other kinds of educational institutions. (Sec. 326(a)). *The Education system has an obligation to make available some employment opportunities for youth enrolled under this subpart.*

**Title II, Subpart 2 – Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects**

1. The prime sponsor is required to include, in the proposed agreement to conduct such a project, a description of arrangements made with school systems–including school cooperative programs. (Sec. 336(b)(1)). *Educators have an obligation to work with prime sponsors in making such arrangements.*

2. The prime sponsor is required to describe plans for coordinating the training and work experience with school-related programs, including awarding academic credit. (Sec. 336(b)(2)). *Educators have an obligation to participate in forming and carrying out these plans.*

3. Projects are required to be conducted in such a manner as to permit participating in-school youth to coordinate their jobs with classroom instruction. (Sec. 337(b)(2)). *Educators have a responsibility to arrange school schedules–and the school day–in ways that make such coordination workable and effective.*

**Title II, Subpart 3 – Youth Employment and Training Programs**

1. The program for in-school youth, under this subpart, must be administered, under contracts with the prime sponsor, by an LEA, a consortium of LEAs, or by a postsecondary educational institution. (Sec. 346(c)(2)). *Educators have an obligation to administer such efforts.*

2. The program for in-school youth may include a variety of school-to-work transition services for *all* youth, ages 16-21 as well as special work experience programs for economically disadvantaged youth. (Sec. 345(a)(2)). *Educators have an obligation to plan for implementing programs of both types.*

3. Economically disadvantaged in-school youth participating in this subpart are to be selected by the educational institution based on certification made by school-based guidance counselors. (Sec. 346(c)(6)). *Educational institutions have an obligation to perform this selection function and to demonstrate its validity.*

4. Not less than 22 percent of the funds available under this subpart must be used for programs for in-school youth under agreements between prime sponsors and LEAs. (Sec. 343(d)). *LEAs have an obligation to make sure this 22 percent is a minimum, not a maximum, and to enter into subcontracts with postsecondary education institutions to serve youth in such settings.*

5. LEAs are required to secure funds from prime sponsors for use, in part, to employ additional school-based counselors to carry out provisions of this subpart. (Sec. 346(c)(3)). *LEAs have an obligation to do so without supplanting currently employed counselors.*

6. Special provisions are made to encourage programs to make available employment and career counseling to presecondary youth. (Sec. 348(c)(1)(E)). *Educators have an obligation to discover and implement ways of making this a reality.*

7. Ten percent of funds available under this subpart may be used for work experience programs for youth from various socioeconomic levels and are not restricted to economically disadvantaged youth. (Sec. 345(a)). *Educators have an obligation to plan for and implement this section of the Act.*

8. Youth Councils are to be established under this subpart. (Sec. 346(b)). *Educators have an obligation to participate in such youth councils and for working constructively with them.*

There are, thus, a minimum of 20 legal obligations for education specified in this law. When viewed collectively, they tell us a great deal about *what* education is to do, but very little about *how* these obligations are to be met.

**Specific Youth Needs Addressed in the YEDPA Legislation**

Title II of YEDPA contains references to a variety of youth needs to be met jointly through collaborative efforts of CETA prime sponsors, community based organizations, and educational institutions. While education is not *solely* responsible for meeting these needs, it behooves all educators to be aware of their nature. Including both in-school and out-of-school youth, Subparts 1 and 2 pertain to needs of economically disadvantaged youth, ages 16-19. Subpart 3 refers to needs of all youth, ages 16-21 as well as certain additional needs of economically disadvantaged youth.

A summary listing of such youth needs for economically disadvantaged youth includes the need to:

**Subpart 1:**

1. Earn enough money so they can remain in high school

2. Earn enough money so they can return to high school (for dropouts)

3. Find ways of re-entering high school (for dropouts)

4. Discover career-related reasons for completing high school

**Subpart 2:**

1. Earn money while acquiring specific vocational skills

2. Expand options for vocational skill training beyond those offered by the education system

3. Acquire general employability skills

**Subpart 3:**

1. Engage in subsidized work experience that will enable them to explore career options and make better career decisions

2. Acquire specific vocational skills

3. Be recipients of transition services called for in this subpart available to all youth

Under Subpart 3, a total of 16 youth needs are identified to be made available to all participating youth, ages 16-21. These include, for example, the need for:

1. Counseling, including career counseling

2. Occupational, educational, and labor market information of a national, State, and local nature

3. Assistance in making the transition from school to work

4. Career exploration in both the public and private sector

5. Job [illegible]ent assistance

6. Assistance in combatting race and sex stereotyping as deterrants to full freedom of educational and occupational choice.

These youth needs have been listed for three purposes: (a) to illustrate that they represent needs all three partners in this collaborative effort have been trying to meet for several years; (b) to emphasize that the Act provides a series

of new resources and development of approaches to meeting these needs; and (c) to point out once more that these needs are to be met through a *collaborative* effort.

**Opportunities for Needed Educational Change**

American education cannot fully meet its YEDPA obligations through its present structure. Change is needed. Such change must be planned and implemented in ways consistent with *all* basic goals of education and the educational needs of *all* students. YEDPA provides education with several opportunities for basic change as it seeks to meet its obligations under this Act.

**Opportunity 1: To plan and implement ways of utilizing the broader community in the educative process.** Several parts of YEDPA contain provisions for in-school youth to utilize the personnel and physical resources of the broader community, as well as those of the education system, in preparing themselves for work. This should be welcomed as an opportunity to use the community as a learning laboratory. Educators have known, for years, that youth can and do learn in more places than the classroom, in more ways than through reading books, and from more persons than classroom teachers. In this increasingly complex society, we can no longer plan to duplicate community learning resources within the schoolhouse walls. If we can apply such principles to the business/labor/industry community, we can also apply them for other purposes to such community settings as libraries, museums, art galleries, and community service agencies. Just as students can learn outside of the school building, so, too, can educators. To seize this opportunity would provide educators a means to implement such longstanding educational goals as those found in the extended school day, the distended school, and the year-round school.

**Opportunity 2: To learn about and implement new ways of awarding academic credit.** Throughout the YEDPA, repeated emphasis is placed on the need to find ways of awarding academic credit for work experience. Since four out of every five high schools already do so, there is nothing new about the concept. What is new is the request that academic credit be awarded for experiences neither supervised nor evaluated by professional educators. On top of this, parts of YEDPA also ask for academic credit to be awarded both for basic academic skills and employability skills acquired through the YEDPA experience.

American education faces serious and inescapable responsibilities both to guarantee the validity of academic credit granted and for assuring that such credits are appropriate to count toward graduation requirements. These

responsibilities can be met within the framework of the YEDPA legislation only if planning and implementation efforts in the arena of performance evaluation are stressed. Such efforts must move us away from so great a dependence on the amount of time spent in a classroom as a criterion for credit-counting and toward a greater emphasis on demonstrated performance. Resistance to performance evaluation, as a basis for granting academic credit, has come both because some educational experiences defy pure performance evaluation and because instrumentation for performance evaluation remains imperfect. If the YEDPA legislation can serve to stimulate educators to value, to validate, and to use performance evaluation as a basis for granting academic credit, a significant step will have been taken toward improving our entire system of formal education. The large sums of discretionary knowledge building funds available under YEDPA should help greatly.

**Opportunity 3: To provide diversified educational opportunities for students within the framework of an integrated educational system.** All three subparts of Title II of YEDPA provide multiple opportunities for special services aimed at helping economically disadvantaged students. It is a direction that is eminently *necessary*. This is not to say it is *sufficient*. We must follow this same principle for all. This, too, represents an opportunity for educational planning and implementation long overdue in American education. The principle under question is what some have described as the "doctrine of fairness" which holds that, to be fair to all students, we must expose all to exactly the same experiences. To those who recognize and value individual differences, it is better known as the "doctrine of unfairness"—i.e., as a doctrine that should be abolished. A true "doctrine of fairness" would demand that, assuming a common core of basic knowledge at what Commissioner Ernest Boyer has described as the "basic school" and "middle school" levels, differing educational opportunities be made available, in the form of both in-school and community educational experiences, for *all* students. If the YEDPA legislation can stimulate a basic change in American education, especially at the grade 10-12 level, aimed at providing a variety of kinds of "learning to do" and "doing to learn" educational experiences for *all* students, it will have made a significant contribution.

**Opportunity 4: To enhance and protect freedom of career choice.** Both Title I and Subparts 1 and 2 of YEDPA's Title II are restrictive in terms of the type of work experience and training opportunities made available to economically disadvantaged youth. The economic rewards resulting from participation may well cause many such youth to narrow their consideration of possible occupational choices to those available under the Act. To avoid this danger, it is essential that educators start planning now to discover ways of helping economically disadvantaged youth whose career goals differ from

opportunities available under this Act to discover alternative ways of moving toward such career goals.

Once again, education is faced with a stimulus opportunity to change holding implications for all students. One's career choices profoundly affect the individual's total lifestyle. Such choices have been unduly restricted for many youth on the basis of parental occupation, socioeconomic level, occupational stereotyping based on race, sex, and physical handicaps, and, most of all, by inadequate opportunities to engage in career exploration in the occupational society itself. With more than seven out of every ten youth currently enrolled in secondary schools and colleges currently expressing need for more help in career decisionmaking, the time has surely come to consider this as a challenge for educational planners and decisionmakers. The need to plan for and provide multiple opportunities for career exploration for *all* students is made clear by the special challenges the YEDPA legislation poses for economically disadvantaged students. It is a need that must be met.

**Opportunity 5: To relate educational experiences to later lifestyle activities of youth.** Title II, Subpart 3, of YEDPA calls for school based counselors to certify that work experience opportunities are related to career and educational goals of participating students. This, of course, is only the top of the "iceberg" of educational relevancy. Whether or not work experiences are related to educational experiences will, in reality, depend on the degree to which the teaching faculty recognizes the need and possibilities for doing so. Important as counselors obviously are, it is in the classroom, not in the counselor's office, where the student will either experience–or fail to experience–relationships between school subjects and work experience opportunities available under YEDPA.

If YEDPA can stimulate American education to move toward an increased emphasis, in every classroom, on the usefulness of subject matter in both career and other lifestyle activities, great progress will have been made. Such an effort will surely alleviate such current symptoms of educational deficiency as lowered test scores, classroom discipline, and high truancy rates. When both student and teacher can clearly see the usefulness of the subject matter, the general health of American education will surely improve. The key person among professional educators is the classroom teacher. Hopefully, implementation of YEDPA will reinforce this most basic of all educational truths.

It is apparent that the YEDPA legislation addresses a host of youth needs that have been of concern to American education for several years. It is equally apparent that, by calling for a collaborative effort involving other segments of the community also concerned about such youth needs, the odds of meeting such needs is enhanced.

The YEDPA legislation clearly calls for the active and deep involvement of professional educators. The obligations of educators contained in this legislation cannot be fully met unless some basic changes are made in the system of education. This legislation can serve as a catalyst for stimulating such changes in directions that will enhance the quality of education. It is an opportunity that must not be missed and a challenge that must be met.

## THE COMMUNITY CAREER EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTER CONCEPT

Among the basic principles the career education concept has held as inviolate, the following are particularly appropriate to this presentation:

1. The costs of career education should come from a combination of reallocation of current education resources and existing community resources.

2. The education system should make full use of the existing business/labor/industry/professional/government community rather than trying to stimulate or duplicate that community within the framework of education.

3. Career awareness, career exploration, and work experience opportunities for students should be made available in the existing occupational society.

4. The career education concept should extend to adults as well as to youth.

It is important that each of these basic principles be preserved.

As the career education concept has evolved and attempts made to convert that concept into an operational level, a series of practical problems has become apparent. These problems are particularly obvious and acute in urban settings. It is suggested here that creation and operation of a Community Career Education Resource Center represents one viable answer to such practical problems.

Three sub-topics must be discussed: (a) the rationale behind the concept of a Community Career Education Resource Center (CCERC); (b) the nature and functions of the CCERC; and (c) alternative approaches to establishing and operating a CCERC.

### Rationale for the CCERC

Three practical implementation problems, each growing out of the career education concept, combine to form the rationale for the CCERC. Each deserves brief discussion and identification here.

First, the career education concept calls for all elementary school pupils to gain career awareness in the occupational society and for junior/senior high school students to experience career exploration and obtain opportunities for work experience in that society. In the large urban areas, where multiple thousands of students are enrolled in the K-12 school system, this becomes extremely difficult to accomplish in an effective and efficient manner. Simply the logistics of planning and conducting field trips designed to offer career awareness opportunities for all elementary school pupils in a variety of sectors of society are discouraging to contemplate. When one considers the still more time-consuming activities involved in career exploration and work experience opportunities for junior and senior high school students, the situation becomes almost impossible to comprehend and obviously impossible to implement in a practical and comprehensive manner. No matter how willing and eager employers are to accommodate such needs, they find themselves unable to do so fully and still run their operations in an efficient and profitable manner. Some more efficient means are needed to: (a) screen both classes and sites for career awareness and career exploration experiences; and (b) make sure that students involved in such activities are persons who are ready for and can profit by the experiences. The CCERC is one possible answer to these difficulties.

Second, the career education concept recognizes that educators, as well as their students, have much to learn about the occupational society. If teachers are to infuse knowledge regarding that society into their lesson plans, they need some quick and accurate means of gaining information about that society. If they are to plan field trips for their students, they need some way of knowing what to expect to find on any given field trip so that they can better prepare their students for it and follow up later on the visit. The career undecided student needs help from his/her teachers and counselors in selecting, from all possible opportunities in the occupational society, those that would be most profitable for use in career exploration. Those school officials responsible for operating work experience programs need some way of screening students in order to ensure that the work experience will be viewed favorably by employers and students alike. There is a real need for inservice of educators in all these matters. Here, too, the CCERC represents one possible answer to consider.

Third, many community members who could and should profit from a community career education effort are not students enrolled in the K-12 public school system. Some are enrolled in private K-12 schools. Others are out-of-school youth who, for various reasons, have failed to make a successful transition from school to work. Still others are adults in the community faced with problems of mid-career change and/or re-entering the occupational society. A community career education effort that ignores the career education

needs of such persons is both inefficient and unfair. The CCERC is one way of meeting needs of these persons.

With this background of need and recognition of practical problems facing us, let us now examine the possible nature of the CCERC.

**Nature of the CCERC**

To begin, it should be recognized that the CCERC is designed to serve the school system and the community, not a single school building within a system. While it could be conducted under the auspices of either the school system, some community agency or combination of agencies, or as a joint effort involving both school system and the broader community, it is, in no way, a concept seen as applicable to a single school building.

There are at least three possible levels of content that could be considered in conceptualizing a CCERC. At the broadest level, one could conceive of a CCERC that encompassed, to the greatest possible degree, the entire occupational society. Such a CCERC might very well be thought of as being divided into 15 sections, one for each of the 15 OE occupational clusters. At a second level, one could envisage, especially in large urban areas, separate CCERCs for each of the 15 OE clusters. That is, one might be a "Transportation CCERC," another a "Manufacturing CCERC," a third a "Business and Office Occupations CCERC," etc. Under these arrangements, the 15 CCERCs could be operated under the magnet concept with students from any part of the city being eligible to visit any of the 15 CCERCs in operation. At a third level, one could conceive of CCERCs being constructed individually for each of several large industries in the community. Under this arrangement, each would concentrate on occupations found within that industry. Obviously, other possibilities exist. These three are given here in order to illustrate the flexibility of the CCERC concept.

No matter what the organizational arrangement, any existing CCERC should be thought of in terms of a variety of operational components. The first such component is an occupational information center. In this center, the person (e.g., student, teacher, adult community member) could find up-to-date local occupational information regarding the nature of the local occupational society. Such information will have been collected by and/or with persons working in the local occupational society. It should include information regarding the nature of each occupation, the education appropriate for entering it along with other entry requirements, and information regarding its relationships to the larger society. While the original source of accuracy of such information should come from members of the occupational society, the

information itself may well be written, with the help of teachers, at various levels to meet the needs of various age ranges and levels of career development. At its simplest level, this information may be located in file drawers with occupations listed alphabetically. At its most complex level, all of this information may be stored in a computer with computer terminals in each school building having access to all such information found in a given CCERC. Obviously, a wide variety of alternatives exist between these two extremes.

A second major component of the CCERC can be thought of as an occupational simulation center. The basic idea behind such a center is to construct, with the help and advice of persons from the occupational society, a series of simulation games, exercises, and/or tasks that a person inquiring about that occupation can pursue. To the greatest possible extent, these simulation exercises should be built around the "hands on" principle that allows the individual to explore his/her interests and aptitudes for a particular occupation (or, more generally, a class of occupations) by completing a task, or series of tasks, calling for use of the actual tools used by workers in that occupational field. Persons who have been exposed to this kind of simulation exercise will have opportunity to select (and/or be selected) for participation in particular career exploration and work experience opportunities in the occupational society. The exercises themselves should be constructed in such a form that they can be carried out in an individualized instruction manner and completed in a relatively short time–i.e., an hour or less.

Those interested in this concept can learn more about how it might operate by contacting Mr. Joseph Luke, State Supervisor of Industrial Arts, Utah State Department of Education. Under Mr. Luke's direction, several such simulation centers have been assembled in Utah junior high schools using what were formerly industrial arts and home economics teaching centers. Mr. Luke, with the assistance of industrial arts teachers and persons from a wide variety of occupations, has supervised the construction of a wide variety of such simulation exercises. It is not being recommended here that these devices be placed in individual school buildings, of course, but the basic principles under which Mr. Luke undertook his work in Utah are the ones we are discussing.

The third major component of the CCERC can be thought of as a personnel resource center. In this center, a variety of resources and activities can be envisioned. For example, it will include space and facilities for teachers to use in devising, with the help of volunteers from the business/labor/industry community, career education materials and lesson plans required for infusion of career education concepts in the classroom. In another part of the facility, volunteers from the occupational community might be seen visiting with interested high school students and/or adults from the community with respect to the nature of occupations and occupational opportunities in particular

industries or occupations. A third part of this center might operate as a bonafide placement center for both full-time and part-time job placement and might well be staffed jointly by persons from the local employment service, local school system, and, once again, by volunteers from the occupational society itself.

The entire CCERC should be thought of as a facility designed to serve the community—not just the K-12 school students. Because of this, it should be located in a place (or places) readily accessible to community members and should be in operation at night as well as during daytime hours.

**Making the CCERC Work**

If the concept of the CCERC has appeal, questions will inevitably arise regarding its costs, the means of paying such costs, and who will be responsible for operating and maintaining the CCERC. Again, a very wide range of possibilities exist with only a few examples being presented here.

One possible arrangement may well be found in many urban areas currently faced with a number of empty elementary schools closed because of declining pupil enrollments. Such school buildings would make excellent facilities for a CCERC. If a school board elected to make one or more such buildings available for purposes of housing a CCERC, arrangements could well be made with a local Chamber of Commerce, CETA Prime Sponsor (under the YEDPA Act of 1977), a local American Legion chapter, or any other kind of community group to staff and equip the CCERC.

Certainly, if the school system supplies the building, some combination of non-school community resources should be available for equipping and providing major staff for the CCERC. There is no way the concept can work, of course, without the expertise and involvement of the business/labor/industry/professional/government community. It is not an idea that school systems can implement by themselves even if they suddenly found themselves with surplus funds. (A most unlikely event in these times!) Educators simply do not have the expertise needed to equip or to fully staff a CCERC. This is not to say, of course, that some school staff persons—particularly some of the school system's career guidance counselors—might not find themselves appropriately assigned to the CCERC.

It seems likely that both the financial resources and staff requirements necessary for the CCERC will come from a combination of community resources. For example, if the CCERC contained one section of its occupational information center devoted to information and materials supplied by

local elements of organized labor, it seems reasonable to expect that local labor unions would contribute some funds and personnel to this effort. Similarly, if a given large industry in an urban area wanted its nature and opportunities to be better known to the community, it might well volunteer some of its funds and staff to the CCERC.

On a day-to-day base, the CCERC, as envisioned here, would be staffed, at least in part, by retired persons from the occupational society who would work on either a paid or volunteer basis in the CCERC. The wealth of experience and expertise found among members of the retirement community represents a rich resource for career education in any community. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that many members of the retirement community might be willing to volunteer some of their time to assure the successful operation of the CCERC.

Another possibility would be to think of CCERC's being operated under direction of CETA prime sponsors in urban areas. With passage of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, each CETA prime sponsor is faced with the challenge of making career exploration and work experience opportunities available to a wide range of both in-school and out-of-school youth. They are also required, under this legislation, to enter into cooperative agreements with local educational authorities. The CCERC concept may be an extremely viable one for consideration by CETA prime sponsors faced with a task of implementing this legislation.

It should be made clear that, in proposing the concept of the CCERC, we are, in no way, suggesting that it be financed, staffed, and operated entirely under the auspices of the local education system. In addition to being obviously impractical, such an arrangement would be contrary to the career education concept itself. Unless the broader community is willing to become involved and committed to the implementation of the CCERC concept, there is no point beginning it.

Operational implementation of the career education concept, particularly in urban areas, calls for some middle ground between trying to simulate the community in the school and simply drowning the community with students in search of career awareness and career exploration opportunities. The CCERC concept, even in the embryonic fashion it has been portrayed in here, seems to represent a possibility worthy of serious consideration. It is hoped that these remarks will prompt leaders from both education and from the larger occupational society in many urban communities to consider how this concept could be converted into reality in their communities.

## References

1. Hoyt, K. *The Concept of Collaboration.* A monograph from the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.



GPO 932-496